

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginsa 22313-1450 www.msplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE                         | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.  |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--|
| 09/504,813  | 02/16/2000                          | Shuji Goto           | 09792909-4468       | 6161              |  |
| 26263<br>SONNENSCH  | 7590 05/18/201<br>IEIN NATH & ROSEN | EXAM                 | EXAMINER            |                   |  |
| P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION, WILLIS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 06066-1080 |                                     |                      | CREPEAU,            | CREPEAU, JONATHAN |  |
|   |                                     |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER      |  |
| CHICAGO, IL 00000 1000  |                                     |                      | 1795                |                   |  |
|   |                                     |                      |                     |                   |  |
|   |                                     |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE     |  |
|   |                                     |                      | 05/18/2010          | PAPER             |  |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.  | Applicant(s) |  |  |
|------------------|--------------|--|--|
| 09/504,813       | GOTO ET AL.  |  |  |
| Examiner         | Art Unit     |  |  |
| Jonathan Crepeau | 1795         |  |  |

|   | Jonathan Crepeau  | 1/95  |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ears on the cover sheet with the o  | orrespondence add   | ress                                     |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP   | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL  | LOWANCE.  |  |
| <ol> <li>X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on<br/>application, applicant must timely file one of the following<br/>application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App<br/>for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (<br/>periods:</li> </ol>   | the same day as filing a Notice of a<br>replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit<br>eal (with appeal fee) in compliance                 | Appeal. To avoid abar<br>t, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the<br>(3) a Request         |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I   | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth   | in the final rejection, whi   | chever is later. In                      |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(   | b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE   |   |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL. | tension and the corresponding amount of<br>shortened statutory period for reply origing<br>than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Office                | ite extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte<br>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w<br>AMENDMENTS   | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the  | of the date of<br>appeal. Since          |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,     (a) They raise new issues that would require further co     (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belc  | nsideration and/or search (see NOT  |   | cause                                    |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or  |   | lucing or simplifying the   | ne issues for                            |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a<br>NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | corresponding number of finally reje  | cted claims.  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13  |   | mpliant Amendment (I  | PTOL-324).                               |
| <ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   |   | imely filed amendmer  | t canceling the                          |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prorthe status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   | be entered and an e   | xplanation of                            |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |   |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>   | vercome all rejections under appea  | l and/or appellant fail:  | to provide a                             |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | n of the status of the claims after er  | ntry is below or attach   | ed.                                      |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br>See Continuation Sheet.   | t does NOT place the application in   | condition for allowan   | ce because:                              |
| 12.  Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13.  Other:   | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   |   |  |
|   | /Jonathan Crepeau/<br>Primary Examiner, Art U   | nit 1795  |  |

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants assert that none of the applied references teaches the lealmed winding, heating, and sealing steps. First, it is noted that the Narang, Schneider, and Gozdz references are not relied on to teach these features. Regarding Kumeuchi, this reference is believed to teach these features and renders the claimed invention obvious when combined with the other references. Applicants have not proffered any new arguments with respect to Kumeuchi and the Examiner's remarks on page 6 of the previous Office action remain applicable.